SEAMEN RANK AND FILE REVOLT AGAINST THE STALINIST BUREACRACY

THE MILITANT

Published Twice a Month by the Communist League of America (Opposition)

VOL. III, No. 32, NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 1, 1930. PRICE 5 CENTS

13 Years of Russian Revolution!

The socialist fatherland is thirteen years old this week! It is worth reminding those who have come to take it for granted, that the first stormy days of the Russian revolution were the days of those false prophets in the camp of the capitalists and their "socialist" assistants who predicted that the "Russian choas" would dissolve in a few weeks into a peaceful capitalist democracy. The few weeks became a few months. The few months gave way to a few years. The capitalist class, so firmly convinced that their services as masters are indispensable to society, could not imagine the working class not only taking the state power into its own hands, but running it successfully for more than a decade and organizing a classless society. The social democrats, steeped in their parliamentary-democratic prejudices, and reflecting the hopes of the master class they really serve, refused and still refuse to give sanction to a proletariat that came to power by any means other than that of the MacDonalds, the Hillquits, the Vanderveldes, the Noskes and Muellers. The thirteenth anniversary of the Russian revolution adds another tombstone over these rotten prophets. The proletariat has shown its ability to seize power, to hold it, and to lay the foundations for a new society, thus opening a new chapter in the history of human kind.

THE OBSTACLES IN THE ROAD

To the Russan proletariat and its party, the Bolsheviks, go the honor of being the first. They have drawn with bold, majestic strokes the outlines of the road the working class everywhere must travel in order to emancipate itself from the yoke of capitalist enalavement. Never before has a ruling class been subjected to such arduous tasks, or confronted with such apparently insurmountable obstacles. The wrack and ruin of the imperialist war; the oppressive heritage of czarist backwardness, ignorance, bureaucracy; the devastation of the civil war organized by the domestic reaction and backed by foreign imperialism; the direct military intervention of Wilson, Poincare, Benes, the Milkado, the Kaiser, Lloyd George and Co; the economic and then the credit blockade; the ravages of the famine—the plagues of biblical times could hardly have been worse than these.

Added to these obstacles, which a state where the few rule could never have overcome, have been difficulties of another nature. The Russian proletariat came to power under the Red Flag, the banner of the international working class revolution. It calculated upon the rapid and indispensable development of the revolution in other countries to come to its aid. A combination of circumstances—some of which might have been averted by correct Bolshevik strategy—set back the revolutionary movement, and compelled the Russian working class and peasantry to continue the work of defending and strengthening the proletarian fortress by their own direct efforts. That enormous progress has already been made since the day when power was taken, in the face of the burdensome, unwanted heritage of the past, is eloquent proof of the giant's vitality of the proletariat, its immense capacities, and the inspiring power of the socialist ideal.

THE TREACHERY OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATS

At the same time, it is implicit with the truth that the state aid of the revolutionary proletariat of Europe would have changed infinitely more the complexion of society today, would have produced successes before which those attained on a national scale would shrink into insignificance. The treachery of the social democrats, who sold their proletarian ideals for the right to serve the capitalist class in the ranks of the working class, is revealed in truly monstrous proportions in the lights of this fact. Their effective work in stemming the revolutionary tide —frequently at the safe end of machine guns—is the historical crime that has set back society for a decade and threatens to set it back for another.

But these are not the only difficulties of the Soviet power. To ignore the others, today more acute than ever, is to do that peculiar, detestable dis-service to the revolutionary cause for which a whole section of the Communist movement and its leadership primarily, has been selected. The infuriated cries of these courtiers and courtesans, who regard revolutionary critics as **lese majeste,** make this criticism all the more imperative, for its absence is a guarantee of decadence.

The threat to the Russian proletarian revolution to which we refer is a reflection of the whole capitalist encirclement of the U. S. S. R., of the pressure of imperialism and the war danger from without, and the upward strivings of the capitalist elements within the Soviet Union itself. The danger is embodied in the ruling regime within the Bolshevik party, the corrosive course of Centrism oscillating between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, embodied in the dominant Stalin faction. The Party and the revolution have been sincerely punished by it.

For proletarian internationalism, the Stalinist usurpers have substituted a petty-bourgeois nationalism, a "consoling" philosophy of socialism "in one country." For the live, pulsing, vigorous proletarian Party, Stalinism has substituted a hideous caricature in which all that is retained of democratic centralism is an exaggerated bureaucratic domination, where the Party worker does not dare to criticize or speak his mind. For the fighters and leaders of the October revolution whom it has sent into Siberian exile, in the prison, into banishment, it has substituted a servile group of incompetent yes-men. For the policies of Lenin, triumphant at every time, it has elaborated a revisionist concoction which produces only defeats and setbacks, and that not only in the Soviet Union, but throughout the world revolutionary movement. In undermining the revolutionary proletarian base of the Bolshevik party it is undermining the October revolution. It has led the workers' republic from one crisis to another, barely escaping catastrophe only because it adopted, at the last minute, one part or other of the platform of the Leninist Opposition it persecutes so rabidly. Our allegiance to Bolshevism, our fealty to the October revolution which has changed only by becoming more profound and staunch, compels us to aid the cause of the world revolution by indicating the danger threatening it and organizing the struggle against it.

THE MEANING OF THE OPPOSITION

The proudest heritage of the world proletarian vanguard, the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, the foundations of the Bolshevik revolution, are embodied in the Left Opposition. It is pledged to defend them tenaciously, without yielding to the assaults of capitalism or its socialist retainers, or to the ravaging attacks of Stalinism. The vanguard fighters hail the 13th year as the victory of Bolshevism, but not of Stalinism. Our warmest greetings to the proletariat of the U. S. S. R.! Our warm and comradely salute to the courageous fighters of the Bolshevik Opposition whom a usurpatory clique has confined in dungeons and exile, and to their leader and ours, comrade Trotsky!

Long live Bolshevism and the world revolution!

—S-n.

RESULTS OF THE ELECTION

Outstanding in the national elections just concluded is the enormous increase of Democratic party strength in the country, raising it to a power it has not enjoyed since the days of Woodrow Wilson's administration. To state it more accurately, it should be said that the most significant feature was the almost unprecedented defeat of Hoover administration.

Hoover and his party were swept into office with an immense majority in 1928. Traditional Democratic strongholds in the South were captured for the first time since the Civil War. Despite the relatively huge vote for Smith at that time, the Democratic party seemed to have received a blow at its very vitals.

The 1928 Hoover was the great monument to the unparalleled "prosperity", the fat years of American capitalism.

The Democratic Sweep

Speaking volumes for the jerky and abrupt rapidity of events and changes in our times, less than two years in office were required to deliver an even more crushing blow to the administration than Smith suffered in the presidential elections. Lost fortresses have been retaken by the Democrats. The most extravagant predictions of Democratic leaders pale before the actual returns. As colorless a candidate as Roosevelt succeeded, in spite of the stigma of Tammany Hall, in piling up an absolutely unprecedented plurality. Mossy Republican states like Ohio, Illinois, Kansas and elsewhere went Democratic. In Minnesota, a Democratic Senator was returned for the first time in almost three-quarters of a century. The Democrats took over most governorships and lost but one. They have changed the relationship of forces in both houses of Congress, where it appears at this writing that they may be sufficiently represented to organize both houses for themselves. In a word, Hoover and the Republican Party were almost everywhere heavily snowed under.

In 1930 Hoover defeat is the first political tombstone erected to mark the passing of prosperity.

The fierce crisis, with its mass unemployment, has made its mark on the elections. Even the hardy perennial of American politics, prohibition, took a distant second place. The intoxication even of the masses with a delusive prosperity which produced the tremendous Hoover majority, has given way a blind dissatisfaction of the masses with the crisis and its ravaging effects. The Democratic party was "endorsed" only in the most purely parliamentary sense. In actuality, the Democrats were not so much the recipients of an endorsement as the Republicans—short-sighted held **solely** responsible for the crisis, instead of being regarded as one of the pillars of capitalism which produced the crisis—were the recipients of a condemnation.

Hoover is the staunchest representative of capitalist reaction, as is the principal opposing party—the Democratic. The revolt against the Republican party was not led by the big bourgeoisie, but by the petty bourgeoisie, the middle class so brutally hit by the crisis. The middle class led the mass of the workers and poor farmers behind it, directing the futile revolt into the stagnant pool of the second capitalist party.

The profound dissatisfaction of the masses is incontestable. Equally incontestable is the fact that the proletariat in the United States has not yet taken the first big steps to break away from the ideological and organizational dominance of the bourgeoisie. If the votes for the Democrats do not prove this sufficiently, the votes for the Communist and Socialist parties do.

The Socialist vote must have been a great disappointment to those who received it. In spite of the contemptibly petty bourgeois, reformist campaign it conducted—revolting to any class conscious worker—it only superficially doubled its vote (according to reports at hand up to now). We say superficially, because in reality, it did little more than stagnate. In New York City, for instance, the standard bearer, Weldman, doubled his 1928 vote, it is true, but recorded no increase over the 1922 vote, not to speak of Thomas' mayoralty vote last year, or Hillquit's 1917 vote. For a socalled "radical" party today to double, or even treble its vote in comparison with a pre-crisis i. e. 1928 or earlier, vote, is no achievement at all. The S. P. received thousands of petty bourgeois votes; its disgraceful Jewish-nationalist campaign in some districts ("every good Jew should vote for Vladeck") brought it many nationalistic votes. But the distribution of its vote nevertheless shows that this petty bourgeois party of capitalist democracy gained a majority of its support from workers.

The Communist Vote

This is all the more noteworthy in face of the poor showing of the Communist Party, a penalty for which Stalinism makes our Party pay. In New York City (the only count at hand at this writing) Foster got 15,560 votes more than double the Weinstone vote of last year. But that was a humiliating low point for the Party. The Party's banner bearer this year did not succeed, however, in even doubling the 1928 gubernatorial vote, that is, a vote cast before the crisis or the unemployment! The tottering S. L. P., with less than one-tenth the Party's apparatus or influence, quadrupled its 1928 gubernatorial vote!

We will return more exhaustively to the results of the elections in the next issue.

In the Next Issue

Pressure of space, due largely to the need of publishing the declaration of the Marine Workers' Opposition, compelled us to omit from this issue a number of very important articles: the A. F. of L. convention in Boston, a complete analysis of the elections, the continuation of Trotsky's article on Stalin as a theoretician, and many others. They will all appear in the next number of the paper, which will be printed in about a week in order to make up for the delay in publishing the present number.

See p. 6

The Coming Dressmaker s Strike

The Bureaucratic Leadership Fails to Make Real Preparations

The situation and the problems confronting the needle trade workers and the N. T. W. I. U. at present need a sober and careful evaluation. For years now, the needle trade workers of America have fought against the bosses. against the treacherous brand of leadership, and for a working class trade union. But all their unheard-of sacrifices and hard won conditions, were sold by the Right wing fakers for a few piece of silver to the bosses. The consistent policy of the Right wing clique, in working hand in hand with the bosses, has been carried on at the expense of the workers.

For years the Left wing, under the leadership of the T. U. E. L. has gathered and molded the discontent and rebellious spirit of the needle trade workers into an organized sentiment. As a result of that work, the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union came to life, representing all the branches of the trade and endowed with the faithful devotion of thousands of class conscious. experienced fighters.

Since its inception, the N. T. W. I. U. has had a number of very instructive experiences, which must serve us as a guide in discussing the tasks facing the union at present, Not one of the lessons, whether it was a victory or a defeat for the workers, can be lost sight of in our present preparations for a general strike of the dress makers, who are a very important branch in our union.

The Strike Plan

The demands and the plan for preparation of the dress strike to be called this coming February, were adopted by the shop delegates' council on October 6, followed by a meeting of the membership a week later. There is no doubt that the question of the strike in its entirety must time and again be elaborated upon and discussed in a far different manner than it was at the delegates council. The discussion certainly did not reflect the importance of the strike issue. On the contrary. there was no desire on the part of the delegates supporting the official point of view to open the discussion. which reveals the very abnormal situation that must be remedied. Why was there no spontaneous desire on the part of the delegates to discuss the plans and demands? Why did the voice of the shop have no desire to speak? Because the atmosphere is stifling, hostile to any view opposing the official decision and leadership — mechanically controlled to such an extent that there is no more place for reason.

New and undesirable precedents are gaining a foothold in the council. No more reports, which should properly precede the discussion. Just "concise" minutes as a matter of record. The reports have been eliminated so that the manager—or as at present, the secretary of the executive committee of the staff—should be assured of not making any deviations.

The discussion that take place is invariably centered upon an attack on those opposing the official "minutes", thereby undermining the interest of the council delegates. The lack of attendance of the elected delegates has caught the eye even of the official leaders—blind as they are to eisting facts and conditions.

The demands for the strike and the plan for preparation was brought down to the council on a string of thin air, completely detached from objective and subjective conditions existing at present in the trade and the union. There was not even an attempt on the part of the leadership to give the delegates a bird's eye view of our strength, the strength or weakness of the enemy (the bosses and the Right wing), the general situation. etc. The demands brought down to us, were not in conjunction with, nor an outgrowth of, a thorough analysis. They were handed down to the council in the same manner as changes in organizational forms and personnel were previously handed down. Take it or leave it—like it or not.

The Strike Demands

The demands are the following: Week work, seven-hour day, minimum wage for various crafts. unemployment insurance. Is there anything wrong with the demands? The dress makers have fought real militant battles for the abolition of piece work. We all know that piece work is degrading for the worker, that it is a source of more profit for the bosses and fierce exploitation for the workers.

It is high time for the Left wing to sound the need for week work, and lead the workers n a struggle for it.

Equally with the seven-hour day, warranted by the surplus number of workers as well as the simplified processes of production. More than that: even a still shorter working day would be applicable to the needs of the workers.

Unemployment insurance is on the order of the day.

Then why such apprehensions on the part of the membership? Why such fear at the outcome of the strike? And here is the key to the situation.

The N. T. W. I. U. convention last June decided that our orientation must be towards a general struggle in the various branches, separately or a few together, to be judged by prevailing conditions and cirumstances Four months passed and what was done in the union to raise the sentiments and inspire the workers for struggle under its leadership? Those were months of changes not for the better, but for the worse. Instead of expansion there has been a diminution of our forces. Instead of a further penetration of unorganized shops, the Right wing shops, instead of giving leadership to the workers against the treason of the Right wing officaldom we have narrowed down our base. All for the sake of securing unquestioned "unanimity"—the last thing a labor union should strive for.

The feeling of desperation that the needle trade workers received from the last strikes of the cloak and fur workers has not been wiped out by any constructive and systematic organization work.

The needle trade workers are quite aware of the fact that the International or the Amalgamated will not solve their problems, will not lead them in struggle for better conditions. But they are also convinced that the wrong policies and criminal neglect of constructive work for our union has given the A. F. of L. fakers a breathing space too long.

We see a report in the press that many hundreds of cloak makers, unemployed furriers, come to a mass meeting. They come to hear the message of the Left wing because they have no faith in the A. F. of L. fakers. The cloak and fur workers have their hope in the Left wing that lead them in such great struggles during, and some time after, the Joint Action fight. **But all these workers are out of our ranks organizationally and don't entrust their daily struggles to us only because the Industrial Union leadership has made so many blunders.**

To regain the faith and trust of the workers, the Industrial Union must begin real organization work. Every member, regardless of political beliefs, must be drawn into the work. Wide-spread, immediate colonization of union members in non-union shops colonization and concentration on a substantial number of shops controlled by the Right wing. The outcome of the strike will also depend on the strength of the wedge that we will success in driving into the International, shop conferences from organized and unorganized shops; not fake. spectacular press reports, but well prepared and carefully planned conferences as will raise the spirit of the workers rather than dampen it.

Preliminary strikes in shops with comparatively worse conditions, street meetings, especially in Italian and Spanish languages. The building up of an active on as the moving force during the period of preparation and the strike itself. General meetings in all localities, bulletins and systematic publicity, and a number of other means must become the task of the day.

The Danger to the Strike

In a word, it is not in the demands that the trouble lies. as the critics of the Lovestone group would have us believe. The principal danger confronting the strike is the one that was so ruinous in the last strikes of the Industrial Union: bluff instead of solid preparations. It must be said now, and quite openly: Unless our union begins with serious work of preparation, drawing in all elements ready to International — demanding organization —are organized into groups by us to carry on a systematic fight against Schlesinger; unless the Left wing changes its disastrous policy of regarding every worker outside the Industrial Union as a "social Fascist"; unless these steps are taken—the coming dress makers' strike is certain to end just like the furriers' strike: in a debacle.

It is up to the serious Left wing militnats in the union to compel serious preparations. The conditions of the workers make it possible to have a successful strike What is needed is that the Industrial Union fulfill its tasks.

—SYLVIA BLEEKER

Sylvan Pollack for the Opposition

In response to a demand for a reply to the questions mentioned below, comrade Sylvan A. Pollack sent the following statement to the Central Control Commission of the Party. His endorsement of the standpoint of the Left Opposition is a further indication of the ferment taking place in the Party, and the refusal to swallow the opportunist-adventurist policy and leadershp foisted upon the movement. Comrade Pollack, editor of **Solidarity,** the official organ of the Workers International Relief, and its agit-prop director, has been a member of the Party since its foundation in 1919, and active in its ranks and in the class struggle in various fields. While in the anthracite coal region as district organizer for the International Labor Defense this July, he was arrested, charged with sedition, and is now out on bail awaiting trial. For a couple of years, he was on the **Daily Worker** staff, and assisted in the relief work during the Passaic, Gastonia, and New Bedford strikes. Militant readers will recall the series of articles on the textile situation he wrote under the pen-name of Frank Bromley. Comrade Pollack, in past internal Party disputes, was a supporter of the old Ruthenberg group. His study of the question since the first expulsion for "Trotskyism" have convinced him, like many others, of the correctness of the Opposition standpoint, and the need for its adoption by the Party.

—o—

In your letter of October 9, you ask me three questions which I will reply to point by point.

Question 1. "What is your opinion about Trotskyism and the Trotzkyite group in the United States?"

The "Trotsky" group (Left Opposition), is conducting a campaign for the reestablishment of the Leninist line in the American party as well as in the Communist International. For that reason I agree with the program of the Communist League of America (Opposition) and believe that all party members and Communist sympathizers should support it. As one who has been a member of the Communist Party since its formation in September 1919 and who has always actively participated in the class struggle, I have, after long and objective study, came to the realization that only by supporting the Left Opposition and adopting its point of view will the international Communist movement regain the strength it had when led by Lenin and Trotsky.

Question 2. "What in your opinion, is their line and activities in relation to the Party and the Comintern? And in relation to the class struggle in general?"

The Left Opposition, under the leadership of Comrade Trotsky internationally and the Communist League here in the United States has formulated the correct policies that must be followed by the Communist movement, that is, a return to the program of Lenin. The national socialism that has been substituted for the Leninist position of the Comintern since Stalin usurped power, must be ended, together with his un-Communist program of "socialism in one country." Comrade Trotsky and the other exiled members of the Russian party must be reinstated and allowed to participate freely in the work of the Party in the Soviet Union. The same rights should be given to the Opposition in the American Party as well as in all other Communst Parties. The expelled members of the American Party should be reinstated and give their aid in the American class struggle. With the unemployment situation becoming more serious and the possibility for mass work especially bright, a Communist party united on Leninist basis is of paramount importance.

Question 3. "Do you have any sympathies whatsoever, with them, or do you agree with the Party that they must be exposed and fought relentlessly as enemies of the Party and of the Comintern and as enemies of the working class, with whom we can have no fraternization, no sympathies whatsoever?"

As my reply to the other questions point out clearly, I do not consider the Left Opposition as enemies of the party or of the working class. In my opinion, the program of the Left Opposition, which is the program of Lenin, will help the Communist movement recuperate from its defeats of the recent past and go forward to victories. Instead of being "renegades," as the supporters of the Left Opposition are called in the official Party press, they are the real defenders and exponents of Communism. In supporting the Left Opposition, I am only continuing the line of revolutionary Marxism I adopted when joined the Communist Party at its foundation in 1919, the same line defended by Lenin and the real founders of the International Communist movement. Instead of putting ridiculous, "Inquisition" questions to Communist militants who differ with the ruling group, we should raise the demands that the Party must eventually adopt:

Reinstate Trotsky and the other expelled Bolsheviks to their rightful places in the ranks of the Communist International!

End the campaign of suppression of all working class expression in the Com munist movement!

Stop the false estimation of events that have become the order of the day in the "third period"!

For a real, and not a stupid, bureaucratic struggle against the liquidators of the Right wing.

Unite the Communist movement for an offensive against the capitalist class!

Long live the international Communist movement! Long live the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics!

SYLVAN A. POLLACK

—o—

As we go to press, we receive word from Chicago that comrade Ida Levin has been expelled by the Stalinists for her support of the viewpoint of the Left Opposition. Expulsion, ignorance, and terror —these are the answers the Party leaders give to the militants who raise questions of principle.

Second Anniversary of the MILITANT

ENTERTAINMENT

At Stuyvesant Casino, 9th St., and 2nd Ave.
On Saturday, November 15, 1930, 8 P. M.

SPEAKER : MUSIC : REFRESHMENTS

All Invited . . . . Admission 25 Cents

Given by the New York branch of the Communist League.

N. Y. OPEN FORUM

EVERY SATURDAY NIGHT

Nov. 8: The Results of the Elections
—MAX SHACHTMAN

Nov. 22: Thirteen Years of the Russian Revolution
—JAMES P. CANNON

Nov. 29: Unemployment and Revolutionary Tactics
—MAX SHACHTMAN

Dec. Prospects for the New Unionism
—JAMES P. CANNON

at the Labor Temple
14th Street and Second Avenue

All Invited : : : : : Admission 25c

Auspices: New York branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition).

THE MILITANT Vol. III. No. 32 Nov. 15, 1930. Published twice monthly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at25 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y. Subscription rate: $2.00 per year; foreign $2.50. Five cent per copy. Bundle rates 3 cents per copy. Editorial Board: Martin Abern, James P. Cannon Max Shachtman, Maurice Spector, Arne Swabeck. Entered as se-cond class mail matter, November 28 1928 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 187$ (Total No. 57)

Against Opportunism and Adventurism of the Right Wing!

On the Proposal for a New Farmer-Labor Party Fraud

The letter printed on this page was recently sent by the national committee of the Communist League of America (Opposition) to its Minneapolis branch. The occasion for the letter was a proposal madeto the League to participate in the founding of a "general Left wing paper" in Mineapolis, to be launched after a conference on October 13 1930, at Superior, Wisconsin. The conference was initiated by the directors of the newly-founded "Farmer-Labor Party of Montana", a movement centering around the **Producers News** of Plentywood, Montana, edited by Charles Taylor and T. J. O'Flaherty, and has been endorsed by the leaders of the Finnish cooperatives in Superior (Halonen and others recently expelled from the Communist Party), by the Lovestone group, and by a scattering of individuals formerly active in various Farmer-Labor Party ventures. The significance of the conference does not at all in any "mass movement" it represents, because it doesn't, but in the thoroughly opportunist conceptions inspiring it. Not the least important of its features is the growing reapproachment between the Lovestone faction and the Right wing Finns who find a common basis in such opportunists adventures, as well as in their general conceptions.—Ed.

In this letter we wish to elaborate on the brief and hurried note sent to you on September 27. We are in a better position to act now because we have had the opportunity to think more thoroughly of the questions involved. because we have received the point of view of comrade Swabeck, and the minutes of your executive committee meeting of October 8 1930.

Four questions are involved, which are all connected with each other and touch upon our fundamental principled position, for maintaining which the Foster group of Centrists combined with the Lovestone Right wing to expel us from the Party and hound us in the revolutionary and labor movements. If we approach these questions from the standpoint of expediency, the need of snap decisions someone compels us to make by a certain date, or from an allegation that a combination of circumstances exists in which our theories and principles are not supposed to hold, we are guaranteed in advance to make terrific blunders, to retard our progress, and compromise our movement. Our point of departure in these as in other important questions can only be that of revolutionary Marxists who do not yield on principles.

I

What Party shall we support in the Minnesota elections: the Communist Party or the Farmer-Labor Party? We believe that the decision of the Minneapolis branch on this point is absolutely correct. We support the only Party of the proletariat, the Communist Party, and oppose the petty bourgeois Farmer-Labor Party and in this we have the approach, not of a faction, but of our **class.** The official C.P. is not merely the only political organization in the elections that speaks for Communism and the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, it is the only Party that represents and defends the interests of the proletariat. Does it do this intelligently, or correctly at all times? There is no dispute among us on that point! It does not. The marionette leadership imposed upon the Party is distorting and discrediting the cause and name of Communism, it defends the proletariat's interests badly at times, and even inflicts great damage upon the cause of the workers. But in spite of that it differs from all other parties by the fact that it DOES defend these interests and the workers who come to its support do it not because of the Reeves and Browders but in spite of them. That is precisely why we, who represent the future of the movement today urge the workers to support the Communist ticket at the same time that we subject the Party leadership and its destructive policies to a merciless criticism. By refusing to take responsibility for the blunders of Stalinism, we uphold the cause of Communism before the workers. The Farmer-Labor Party, on the other hand, represents and defends the interests of the petty-bourgeoisie in the cities and the better off elements among the farmers — the latter dominating the Party in alliance with the corrupt trade union bureaucracy and careerist bourgeois politicians a la Shipstead, Olson and Co.

Take the characteristic case of Lundeen. In which direction has he gone? Unmistakably to the Right. Yesterday, he collaborated with the Communists at least in the socalled "anti-imperialist" work and in the political movement. Today he opposes the Communists and collaborates with the leaders of the Party, which from the letter of O'Flaherty himself, is dominated by the Backus power and lumber interests, and willy-nilly he serves as a mask for these interests. (Lundeen, it is well to bear in mind is to be one of the fathers of the new movement planned for the Northwest.) If it really is a question of what "tail we should ride"—and in actuality it is not at all—then we unhesitatingly choose our Party as against that of Backus-Shipstead-Lundeen. What divides us from Stalinist Centrism is **how** to make the revolution; what divides us from Farmer-Laborism is **why** to make the revolution. The one division can be bridged, the other cannot.

II

The official Party is not a fetich with us. Our relations to it depend upon a multitude of circumstances which differ at various times and places. In general, our attitude is pressure from within the Party by those workers whom we convince of the correctness of our position and by class conscious militants outside the Party. This means a firmly welded Opposition movement, which it must be our primary duty to strengthen. Particularly in Minneapolis, where the relation of forces is very advantageous to us, our efforts should be concentrated upon recruiting revolutionary workers directly into our ranks. We are not building a second Party, so we have little to worry about from the empty accusations to that effect made against us by the Party bureaucrats whose own policies and acts have systematically cultivated the seeds of opportunism and social democracy within and without the Party itself. In this sense, the action of comrade Cowl is incorrect.

Why should this position be construed as leading to "isolation", to "sectarianism?" All analyses that conclude in this manner may be based upon conjecture and upon a sound refusal to become disconnected from the masses, but they are surely not based upon the experiences of the movement, not in one but in many countries. Where has the impatient desire to become a strong movement over night and at any price, led other groups in the Opposition before us? The hostility towards the official Party shown by the Paz group, and its contacts with the Right wing in an attempt to build some sort of a bloc led not to mass contact but to Paz's isolation. Brandler's "mass movement"and conferences for "unity" with Left social democratic elements, his open opposition to the official Party in the Saxon elections led to the inevitable result: thousands of workers who originally followed the Right wing deserted it.

Our position, on the other hand. like that of our French and German comrades, has strengthened us. We have gained new and invaluable recruits from the Party ranks (and we will gain more-, and in addition, we have won the organizational adherence and sympathy (especially in New York) of revolutionary workers outside the Party.

III

As to the "Left wing" paper to be published in Minneapolis, as proposed by Taylor and O'Flaherty, in what way can we involve ourselves in responsibility for it? In your minutes of August 9,1930 it says: "The policy of the paper according to O'Flaherty will be that of a **general Communist organ** with a humorous touch. **Will not be the organ of any faction,** although he proposes to work in harmony with the local E.C. and the N.E.C. of the League. Wants the paper to cover the Northwest class struggle with **a national and international perspective.** Expects to solicit the support of **prominent Farmer-Laborites like Lundeen** and others." The proposal of O'Flaherty for the character of the paper is the principal "humorous touch". It will not be the organ of any faction (that is, presumably, of neither our Group nor Lovestone's) but it will have a national and international perspective. What kind of a perspective? Lovestone's? Ours? The two differ sharply. Or will its "national and international perspective", i. e., its political outlook and policy, be neither Lovestone's nor ours nor that of the official Party? hen whose will it be?

Comrade Cowl raises a pertinent question when he envisages an editorial board "let us say romposed of O'Flaherty, Taylor, Halonen, Gitlow and Dunne or Skoglund" (and maybe, Lundeen!). What will the policy of such a board be towards "two-class parties", towards the Indian or Chinese revolution, towards the dispute in the Communist movement towards the cooperative's role in the class struggle towards the "new unions", in a word towards the whole complex of world and domestic problems which cry out for solution? We think the envisaged composition of the editorial board is a guarantee that the paper will be anything but "in harmony with the local E.C. and the N.E.C. of the League". How will we be able to assume responsibility—without indelibly compromising ourselves—for a paper which sways helplessly between the Left Opposition and Lovestone or the Superior Finnish movement, or the Lundeenites or similar nondescript elements.

We are not opposed to a popular paper which concentrates upon agitating among the workers for a certain minimum program without being definitely and avowedly stamped as the organ of any specific section of the movement. We have had such papers in the movement before, and they have been of service. But at the same time it must be dominated by a **distinct** political conception and guidance, which will not and cannot be the case with the proposal under consideration. The paper will either be torn to pieces by contending viewpoints as soon as an important questions arises, or else it will go along with the Right wing combination represented. by Lovestone, Halonen and others, and compel us to fight it openly from the beginning.

IV

1. The proposed paper is only the literary expression of the other proposal: the formation of a "Farmer-Labor Party movement in the Northwest". Upon what and whom is the movement—which is in our opinion enormously exaggerated by the Montana people—based? All evidence points to the farmers and not the workers. The socalled "movement" has begun in Sheridan County, Montana, where it is avowedly based upon the farmers, as can be gathered by a reading of the **Producers News.** The only other "concrete" instance is North Dakota, where a handful of individuals, formerly associated with such movements has been revived. The exclusively agricultural nature of that state needs no exposition. With the exception of a really insignificant movement among a small group of miners in Illinois, these two (Sheridan County and the North Dakota tempest in a teapot) are the only instances adduced to prove the spread of the Farmer-Labor Party movement. Both of them are farmers' movements in every sense.

As we pointed out in our note of September 27, "The base of the Communist movement is the industrial proletariat. It is not our task to organize the farmers politically into a party. The Comintern everywhere (and in the U.S. particularly) almost broke its neck in similar adventures which had nothing to do with Marxism". Is it not of great significance for us that the further East one goes, i. e., the further one goes towards the section of the country where the industrial proletariat predominates there is less and less of any distinct labor or farmer-labor movement afoot?

2. What becomes of our principled position on "two class parties" in this situation? Has it lost its validity? We think not. Do the adventures with Raditch in Jugoslavia mean nothing? Does the criminal gamble of Stalin-Bucharin with the "four class" party of the Kuo Min Tang, which wrung the neck of the Chinese revoutio and set back the world revolution for years, bear no warning for us? Does the "two class party" formed by Stalin-Bucharin-Roy in India, which has left the Indian proletariat without revolutionary leadership especially in these critical days, teach no lessons? And finally, are the instructive and rich experiences with "two class parties" in the United States, from 1924 to this day, to be lost not only upon Lovestone and the Stalinists but upon us Marxists as well? The articles on the lessons of the Minnesota F.L.P. written for the Militant by our Minneapolis comrades, are worth re-reading, especially comrade Dunne's and comrade Hedlund's recent article endorsed by the Minneapolis branch. What great change has occurred since Hedlund's article?

This whole venture, therefore, is born under an inauspicious star: the two class party. The fact that Taylor and O'Flaherty, who declare their agreement with us on most other questions, are making arguments today so vehemently for a two class party should be already sufficient to make us hesitate. Taylor's arguments are reminiscent of Bucharin in the worst days of the Kuo Min Tang adventure. According to him, the Montana farmers (at least) are virtually proletarians by now! What should make us hesitate even more is that Taylor writes that Gitlow "remarked that he was surprised if the Trotskyists acquiesced, because of the Trotsky position against the 'two class Party'." And good grounds for surprise if we were to cast overboard our elementary principled position on this question for the sake of a bloc with Gitlow and the Superior Finns, who, like Taylor see nothing wrong with Communists not only **joining** a two-class party (and "socalled" is a corect adjective, for in reality it is the petty bourgeoisie that runs these parties), but in **advocating their initiation and organization.** They see nothing wrong in it, because they also agreed and still do agree with the Kuo Min Tang policy of the Comintern, and Roy's policy in India, and the rest of the decalogue of the Right wing in the Communist movement and evidently with the whole Pepperistic conception of the "revolutionary farmers", and Federated Farmer- Laborism. But that is no reason for our supporting such a reactionary hotch-potch.

It is true as comrade Dunne says, that Pepper cannot be credited with originating the idea of a farmers and workers party (that probably goes to Stalin), but Pepper can be "credited" (together with Lovestone and Co.) with having led the American movement through all the disgraceful adventures with Farmer-Laborism in America, with the ideas of the notorious "August thesis", that every political party has a farmer-labor party of its won, that out of the F. L. P. would develop the "mass Communist Party" over night that the Communists — confronted with the "third American revolution"—would become the unblushing hangers-on to the LaFollette kite, etc., etc. Lovestone wants to repeat the yesterdays that should never have occurred. O'Flaherty and the Finns apparently want to turn backwards the wheel of Communist experience and history while we want to move it forward. In that sense we stated before: "It is not our job to revive Pepperism in the northwest but to liquidate all remnants of it."

3. Finally, the Superior conference. We are decidedly opposed to any participation of our group in this conference, just as we are opposed to participating in the formation and promotion of the new paper and "the movement" rising out of it. Our position must be stated categorically and without concealment, so that this agglomeration of opportunists is prevented from carrying out its negotiations and dickerings behind the scenes. What unity could we possibly expect to establish there? The conference is the second inauspicious star of this new "movement". Our position is not determined geographically, and we do not condemn a unity or bloc with the Right wing in Germany, or in New York, only to accept it in Wisconsin. It is proposed to unite all the Communists "not under the organizational whip of Stalin". But being in that state is no particular virtue in itself? At Superior it is proposed that the variegated elements represented there should form a "Communist" nucleus, a "caucus" to represent Communist policies and interests in a "broader Left wing conference". What sort of Communist policies will be represented by a caucus embracing the Lovestone liquidators, the Superior business cooperators (we reiterate the appellation, because it is entirely true), the two

Continued on page 8

Marine Workers' Rank and File Revolts

AN APPEAL O THE MEMBERS OF THE MARINE WORKERS INDUSTRIAL UNION

For some time conditions in the Marine Workers Industrial Union have been very bad. They are going from bad to worse all the time. It is necessary to look into these conditions, to find out what's been happening and why it's been happening—and to find a way out of the crisis in which our union finds itself. It is the duty of every member of our union to face the facts squarely and to make proposals for improving the situation and really building our organization into a genuine militant union.

It is in this fight that we present the following criticisms, suggestions, and recommendations. We hope that the fellow-workers will see it this way and will rally to our support, back up this appeal and fight for the proposals we are making.

OUR AIM

1. Our aim is to build one powerful industrial union uniting all the marine transport workers in the country.

2. Any worker in the marine transport industry regardless of race, creed, color or political opinion, should be eligible for membership in our union.

3. The purpose of the union must be to fight for the bettering of the conditions of the marine workers, to raise wages, shorten hours, improve living conditions, fight against the speed-up, for bigger gangs on the docks and bigger crews on the ships and lighter draughts on the docks for longshoremen, for better food, etc.

4. We are against the whole capitalist system which is responsible for the misery of the workers in all industries. We are unalterably opposed to all imperialist wars. We believe in the international solidarity and militant action of the marine workers to insure better conditions, to fight against imperialist wars, and for the defense of the Soviet Union, today the only workers Republic in the world. We are for a workers Republic in the United States.

5. At this time the most serious problem facing the marine workers is unemployment. There are more than 250,000 marine workers (longshoremen, harbor workers, etc.) jobless and hungry. The economic crisis and the speed-up system are continually increasing the army of unemployed by leaps and bounds. That is why all our activities in building up our union must today center around the fight against unemployment. While fighting for unemployment insurance we must not forget that we must get immediately for ourselves food and shelter—actual instant relief.

TACTICS

6. We must mobilize the workers first of all for the struggle for our immediate needs, for the improvement of our working and living conditions. Only in this way can we get the greatest number of workers into the fight against the bosses. In rallying workers to struggle we must resort to education, organization of our ranks, strikes, organization for the unemployed, organization of the unorganized, and similar tactics to build our union.

7. We must work to build a powerful Left wing movement in all other organizations of the marine workers, thus making possible their unification into one industrial union in the industry. In the craft and conservative unions there are thousands of workers whom we must win over to our program for militant industrial unionism.

If the marine workers are to wage a successful struggle against the ship owners, we must have unity in our ranks. The sectarian policy now being pursued by the Marine Workers Industrial Union only results in segregating the class conscious workers from the masses of less advanced workers, leaving them to be used by the reactionary officials of the conservative unions against a revolutionary class struggle program.

The rank and file members of the International Seamans Union must be won over to a class struggle program for their union and for waging a relentless struggle against the reactionary leadership (Furuseth, Olander) and to replace them by class-conscious workers from the rank and file.

The workers' opposition in the International Longshoremens Association must be supported in their fight to oust the reactionary leaders (Joe Ryan) from their union and an educational campaign must be carried on within their ranks to win them over for the cause of the revolutionary class struggle.

The membership of the Associated Marine Workers who are already in rebellion against their reactionary leadership (Captain Maer) must be won over to our cause and a vigorous campaign must be made to unite these key men with workers on the ships and the docks in one great and powerful industrial union so that a more effective fight can be made against the shipowners for our immediate demands and to hasten the day of complete emancipation for the working class.

8. Name calling and abuse are not the methods for winning over workers to our class struggle. Only by patient hard work in the fight for the every-day needs of the working men can we win their confidence and bring them around to our viewpoint.

9. All strikes must be prepared in advance and properly organized. The workers should first be convinced to strike. Strikes, in order to be genuine, must come through a demand of the workers themselves and not mechanically declared or forced upon the workers.

10. A union in order to be alive must consist of active members. Everything must be done to develop self-confidence and initiative among the rank and file. Without genuine democracy in the union there can be no real live union. Bureaucracy has no place in a real union and only destroys all possibilities for building up the union, for making every member a conscious responsible, active member.

11. The leadership of our union cannot be won and should not be sought by mechanical, artificial, bureaucratic methods. Sound leadership can be won only through gaining the confidence of the workers by tireless activities and sacrifices in the everyday struggle. Leadership based on clique control, on favoriteism, on stifling opinion or strangulating all the rights of the rank and file can only hurt our union.

BANKRUPTCY OF THE PRESENT LEADERSHIP AND ITS POLICIES

We indict the present leadership for its policies on the following grounds:

1. The present leadership pursues an adventurist, sectarian, utopian, unrealistic program.

2. Transforming the Marine Workers Industrial Union into an impotent sect instead of building a mass organization, a genuine union.

3. Following wrong and irresponsible organization methods.

4. Entirely neglecting and dropping all work for the building of a powerful Left wing movement in the craft and conservative unions. Substituting for such important work name calling and merely denouncing as social fascists, etc., all those who are today not in the Marine Workers Industrial Union.

5. A criminal bungling of strikes, following policies of pure adventurism, using the worst bureaucratic methods, actually sabotaging strikes and here and there even resorting to methods which are dangerously provocative.

6. The leadership has foisted upon the union a terribly bureaucratic regime and wiped out all semblance of democracy, of rank and file control in the Marine Workers Industrial Union.

7. The program for the unemployed, formulated by the T. U. U. L. and adopted by the unemployed convention at Chicago, July 4th, has proven to be too abstract to appeal to the unemployed. Although revolutionary, a program incorporating more concrete demands is necessary if the unemployed army is to be marshalled for the class struggle. . . .

We herewith present the following facts from the life and experiences of our union which entirely substantiate our criticism and which prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that only by following the constructive program we have outlined can our union become a real mass union and fight effectively for the interests of the marine workers.

BACKGROUND OF THE WRONG POLICIES OF THE BUREAUCRACY

Starting out as a club, functioning as a propaganda group in existing marine workers organizations, we failed to carry out the original program of the R. I. L. U.

This failure to build strong Left wing groups in the existing organizations was due primarily to the opposition of the leadership of our union to such a policy as first proposed by the R. I. L. U. This resistance to the original policy of the R. I. L. U. to build Left wing groups in the existence marine workers organizations resulted in the unconscious sabotage of the slogan "A Seaman's Club in Every Port." . . .

Upon the returning of the T. U. E. L. representative, (comrade Mink) from Moscow, he made his report with the recommendation that a new industrial union of the marine workers be formed, but comrade Foster suggested a transitional step. During the transitional stage, "The Marine Workers Progressive League" was organized. The League members were to carry our program of class-struggle into the conservative unions and wage a fight against the reactionary leaders, and to popularize the slogan of amalgamation. Comrade Foster also laid particular stress on those points of our policy which dealt with work in the existing unions, and that this work should be intensified.

Despite the fact that "The International Seamans' Club" had a considerable membership, the name of Mink was never submitted to the club members before he was sent to the R. I. L. U. Conference by the T. U. E. L. In a like manner, Foster gave the club members the "decision" that Comrade Mink was to be head of all Marine organizational activities for the T. U. E. L. This so-called "decision" was a piece of highhanded, bureaucratic conniving of Foster upon which the club members were not even allowed to discuss. Who made the decision? Where did it come from? Why was it made? Why weren't the members considered or consulted?

Our activity in the existing marine workers organizations was discouraged by the leadership which told the membership of the League that membership in the existing marine workers organization was not necessary. Not only did the leadership say that it was unnecessary to belong to and carry on work in the existing unions but it even ordered all those who were members of these unions to withdraw from membership. The opposition objected to this wrong arbitrary move of the bureaucracy on the ground that the Left wing group in the Marine Firemen's Union International Seamen's Union) was in a favorable position to oust the reactionary leaders of this union and to replace them with class conscious workers from the rank and file. Mink's only answer to the opposition was:

"The quicker you comrades are expelled from them phoney unions, the quicker we'll build the League and the better I like it." . . . .

INCOMPETENCE AND IRRESPONSIBILITY OF THE BUREAUCRACY

The opposition had put forward the program of spreading out in the port of Greater New York and opening up halls in other ports as rapidly as possible. Under the pressure of the opposition composed of comrades Morgan, Golden, Anderson, Shelligan, Horn, Russell, Fanning, Peltzer, Aaronson, Haigney, McGrath, and others, the leadership was forced to consent to the opening up of a hall in Baltimore. Accordingly comrade Morgan, Port Delegate for New York, equipped comrade Peltzer with a credential and supplies. Comrade Peltzer under very great difficulties and after making many sacrifices succeeded in carrying on propaganda and work for some months without receiving any financial assistance from the T. U. U. L. Despite the opposition of the leadership, comrade Morgan and Aaronson were sent by the rank and file to help comrade Peltzer in the organization work in Baltimore. After having been ousted from Anchorage Seamen's Institute) and having been set upon by the B. & O. bulls, and prevented from obarding the ships it was decided that comrade Morgan should proceed to New York and force the leadership to consent to open a hall as a base for operations, as a rallying center for organizational work.

After comrade Morgan made his report to the League meeting, the members decided in defiance of the leadership over the protest of the bureaucracy, to open a hall in Baltimore. But when the hall was finally opened the rank and file members who carried on the work without any financial assistance from the leadership were recalled. Then Hines was chosen by the bureaucracy to replace the active rank and file workers. . . . Though receiving a subsidy for seven months Hines departed from Baltimore and left nothing but an empty hall on which the rent was due. Whatever progress had been made was completely destroyed by the bureaucrats who instructed Hines to take over the New York Club as soon as he returned from Baltimore.

THE BUREAUCRATS HOLD MASSES IN CONTEMPT

The leadership of our union has nothing but contempt for the great mass of marine workers. This bureaucracy has not shown any real interest in the actual struggle of the marine workers, and has thrown away many good chances which these struggles afforded us for building up the Marine Workers Industrial Union. This contempt for the marine worker masses is shown in part by the following facts:

The leadership failed to take advantage of the opportunity to make contact with members of the Associated Marine Workers before the expiration of their agreement with the Tugboat Owners. This lack of interest shown by the bureaucrats in the struggle of these workers against their reactionary officials and the bosses really lost these workers for the cause of militant unionism.

The leadership neglected for two and a half months after the convention which launched the union, to issue any membership books or publish the "Marine Workers' Voice," our most effective means with which to acquaint the workers with what happened at the Convention. . . .

After the launching of the Union the rank and file made considerable progress among the longshoremen of Baltimore. We held a meeting in front of the I. L. A. halls. But the bureaucracy pursuing a disruptive line of tactics destroyed all our work—destroyed everything which was accomplished. Comrade Harvey acting more like a disrupter than a union organizer antagonized the longshoremen instead of trying to win them over to the cause of militant unionism. This criminal action destroyed all the progress that we had made. It broke up all the contacts which we had made with the rank and file members of the International Longshoremen's Association.

The same contemptuous attitude towards the workers was shown by Mink in New Orleans. The silly and childlike action of comrade Mink in showing off in braggadoccio manner donation checks to workers whom we were just drawing in as new members of our union in New Orleans

The Origin of the Document

The document which appears on these pages is the result of a struggle that has been going on for some time within the Marine Workers Industrial Union, and the Party fraction within it. The document itself is only a re-statement and elaboration of one presented by Party members to the marine workers fraction, which Mink, Johnstone and the rest of the Party and T. U. U. L. bureaucrats dealt within their characteristically contemptuous manner. The Stalinists have been pursuing a course in all the unions controlled by them which has put one after another of them on the rocks. The situation in the Textile Workers Union, the Miners' Union, the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union, are only repetitions in other spheres of the crisis now rending the Marine Workers Industrial Union. The bunglers and worse who direct the destinies of these organizations, virtually all of which began with splendid prospects for growth and influence, have conducted such a policy of arbitrariness, mechanical control, alienation of Left Wing militants not members of one Party faction, bureaucracy, and radically false policies, that they have left a trail of ruin wherever they have stepped in. Testifying to the immense vitality of the "new union" movement, however, is the rank and file revolt expressed in this document. Out of the 17 signers who are the most active spirits in the M. W. I. U., 14 (all those marked with stars) are members of the Party. The Minks, Hineses and Harveys are now planning to expel these militants not only from the Party, but from the Union as well! At all costs this must be prevented. Such tactics can be safely left to Lewis, Sigman and Co. Let the workers discuss the situation objectively. They are capable of deciding and decoiding correctly. They have no need at all for the Minks, Johnstones and Fosters to do their thinking for them, especially when "their thinking" is but a mental echo of their masters in the central apparatus of the Comintern and the R. I. L. U.

Against the Stalinist Union Bureaucracy!

went a long way to demoralize these workers. Comrade Mink showed off his extravagance by staying at a swell hotel while in New Orleans, while the active organizers slept on deck of the union hall and went hungry while they were doing organizing work on ships and docks. This caused many workers to raise embarrassing questions to the organizers who had to sleep on the decks. When comrade Morgan and others asked Mink why this extravagance—Mink could offer no other answer than the excuse that it was orders from the Communist Party. Another case showing the neglect of the workers by the bureaucracy, is to be found in the Independent Tide Water Boatmen's Union which has a membership of 1250 workers. It can conduct activities among 15,000 workers in the Harbor. Comrade Golden informed Mink and Hines of the League about the reported vote of the I. T. B. U. to affiliate with the Marine Workers League. But Mink and Hines just neglected to do anything about it. They even refused to get in touch with the I. T. B. U. or make any effort at all to win over workers in this organization. Thus the bureaucrats threw away another fine opportunity for winning workers to our ranks. Their contempt for the workers again showed itself. In fact this leadership even went so far as expelling members for going into the I. T. B. U., for example, Willy Lang. . . .

THE "LEADERSHIP" RUINS STRIKES

In June the opposition proposed that our union should make preparations to lead a strike of 16,000 longshoremen and seamen in the port of New Orleans in the fall of the year which is the busy season. The board of the union adopted this proposal. Comrades Morgan, Haigeny, Golden, Seaganik and Evans, were chosen to proceed to the New Orleans Port immediately. However, no funds were provided for these comrades and no support whatever was given them in order to enable them to carry out the decisions.

Despite the fact that these comrades had made many contacts in the port of New Orleans and were familiar with the situation, two other comrades totally unfamiliar with the situation in New Orleans were provided with ample funds and rushed down to New Orleans to replace the above comrades originally chosen. Under orders from the bureaucratic leadership of Hines, Harvey and Johnstone, these two members proceeded shortly after their arrival in New Orleans to call a premature strike for which no preparation whatsoever had been made. The result of this strike was to discredit the union in the eyes of the marine workers in that port. Harvey's circulation of a false news release to the effect that a 20% increase in wages was won, only further discredited our organization with the longshoremen. . . .

Yet, this fiasco which the bureaucratic leadership performed in New Orleans was advertised at the last Fifth R. I. L. U. Congress as one of the big achievements of our union. Such bluff is very costly and only hurts the best interests of the marine workers.

Exactly the same bureaucratic adventurist sabotaging policy was followed by the leadership in the recent Philadelphia strike. The night before the Atlantic District United Front Conference in Philadelphia, Sep. 20, 21, there was held a Bureau meeting of the union. Gardos, the District Organizer of the Communist Party of Philadelphia, was present. Comrade Hines was present also. Here it was decided that we should go to this united conference to propose active preparations for a strike. The workers were to go back to their jobs and set up their dock committees and take all the necessary steps for a strike.

Right after the conference there was held in Philadelphia a bureau meeting of the marine workers. There were present at this meeting in addition to the eight National Bureau members of the marine workers seven representatives of the Communist Party. Among these special representatives were Gardos, T. U. U. L. representative, etc. Gardos immediately proposed the withdrawal of the organizers from the Philadelphia field. These workers were Soderburg and Johansen. But the Bureau members protested against this proposal of Gardos. A hot discussion followed. Hudson supported Gardos by making his motion for the withdrawal of the organizers from Philadelphia field. Comrade Hoben amended this motion to the effect that the organizers should stay. There soon followed bitter fights as to who is and who is not a bureau member. Gardos gave himself a vote. Hines and Hudson voted with him. But that was all the votes that Gardos's proposal could muster. The rank and file were against Gardos and Hines. Gardos then said:

> "I, as the District Organizer of the Communist Party, over-rule the decision. This is only a fraction meeting of the Communist Party."

Later the organizers were forced out by a sort of rump meeting which Gardos and Hines set up themselves. The New York members of the union protested against this action. To cover up this high-handed action and to escape the wrath of the rank and file the bureaucracy decided to call a strike in Philadelphia.

Within three days after the recall of these organizers the Party ordered the return to Philadelphia and without calling any meeting of longshoremen to agitate them and convince them for a strike, without having any strike vote of longshoremen, without setting up any strike committees, the bureaucracy issued a mimeographed leaflet calling on the workers to strike. The only meeting that was held before the strike call was issued, was a meting of about 10 Communist Party members who were **seamen** and voted for the longshoremen to go out on strike. When these comrades went down to the docks to call the strike the longshoremen bitterly resented it and beat them up. Furthermore, instead of going to the docks of the coast-wise shipping where we had some strength, these comrades went first to the I. L. A. piers, where we had no strength. Without any previous preparations they notified the longshoremen that there was to be a strike.

This outrageous bureaucratic procedure in our union, this utter disregard of the most elementary rights of democracy in our union destroyed all the sentiment which we had succeeded in building up for our union, wiping out all our gains which we had won only through many months of very hard work. All the results which we had previously achieved by our great sacrifices were destroyed by this adventurist policy.

BUREAUCRACY CRIPPLES OUR UNION

The situation in our union is intolerable. Things simply can't go on the way they are now going. Anybody who criticizes Mink, or even raises a question to him is immediately picked out as a target. A whispering campaign is opened against him in the fraction of the Communist Party and in the Union.

Altho comrade Morgan was elected to the National Committee of the Union by the rank and file delegates of the Convention and the National Committee elected him to the Executive board, yet, the bureaucracy didn't even think it necessary to call an executive board meeting when they decided to expell him from the Executive Board of the Union in June, 1930. Not only was comrade Morgan removed from the Executive Board of the Union but he was removed from all leading committees and not even allowed to function in the capacity of organizer, Morgan's spotless record as an organizer notwithstanding.

Mink made the slanderous accusation against comrade Morgan charging him with refusal to go to the Gulf and with drunkenness. Comrade Harvey even proposed in the Bureau of the Union to expel comrade Morgan from the Party and the Union. Johansen seconded this motion. Hines proposed in the Bureau of the union that this question be referred to the Party and the T. U. U. L. Morgan tried to appeal against this. But he failed. The ridiculous and outrageous character of the charges against Morgan is shown by such indisputable facts as Morgan's being arrested more than one dozen times in New York, Houston (unemployment demonstration), New Orleans, etc., for his activities in trying to build up the Marine Workers Industrial Union. But Harvey found nothing but ridicule for these arrests. Comrade Morgan was conducting his work under very severe difficulties. For instance, in Houston, comrade Mink collected more than $200 in cash but he left Morgan penniless in the field. Yet within two months comrade Morgan succeeded in opening up a hall and in electing a delegation to the National Convention of the Marine Workers Industrial Union consisting of six Negroes and five whites. This was the only bona-fide delegation of longshoremen elected to the convention besides Philadelphia. All other longshoremen delegates were not elected but were handpicked.

For six months Hines was the New York organizer, got the full support, moral, financial, from the union bureaucracy. Yet he couldn't manage to get a single longshoremen delegate for the conference (April 1930). This mess made by Hines in New York came upon the heels of his staying in Baltimore for seven months and doing exactly nothing. Hines, Mink and Harvey have made it a practice to slander individual members when they are not around.

As soon as a member raises his voice in criticism he is immediately made a scapegoat for everything bad that happens, No organization reports, no financial reports, no records of the membership, no activity reports are ever given and to ask for them and press for them means to face a barrage of abuse and attacks.

THE IRRESPONSIBLE METHODS OF WORK AND ORGANIZATION

The criminal bungling and the mismanagement of the organization, the general irresponsibility of the bureaucracy are disrupting our union. For instance, after the club did away with the lunch counter in the headquarters because it attracted very many bad elements to the hall then Mink on his own hook reopened it in defiance of the club members' decision. He conducted it as a private enterprise and without keeping any accounts. . . .

But the Communist Party leadership chose a handpicked committee and after some delay only whitewashed Mink and Hines and company of the charge of running the lunch counter as a private affair.

How the bureaucracy tried to terrorize workers is clearly shown by their tactics towards comrade McGrath. Comrade McGrath who is a good worker and who mobilized the Philadelphia delegation for the National Office was asked to give a statement endorsing the leadership of the union. This statement was to be printed in all the Party papers. But comrade McGrath refused. Steps were then immediately taken to kill him politically. He was removed from all leading committees. He was shelved. Comrade McGrath became disgusted, naturally so.

The various organs and departments of our union don't function. They are dead. The committees don't meet. Insufficient and even false information is sent out. Altho the Executive Board has held meeting after meeting, the membership has never been acquainted with the proceedings or has had a chance to consult the minutes of these meetings. Nor are minutes from other ports available to us. Members are kept in ignorance about the activities of other ports. The bureaucracy prohibits the discussion of the activities of other branches.

OUT WITH THE DESTRUCTIVE BUREAUCRACY — FOR CORRECT CONSTRUCTIVE POLICIES TO BUILD THE MARINE WORKERS INDUSTRIAL UNION.

It is because of these wrong policies, it is because of this denial of democracy in the union, it is because of this terrible bureaucracy, that no new members are being gotten into our union and old members are not paying dues. Today our union gets no response from longshoremen or seamen.

Highhanded political conniving can only hurt our union as it has already done. It must be stopped. We are against such arbitrary ways of working as was done in the setting up of a special bureau to control the convention. There must be an end to the sectarianism in our policies which has caused the marine workers to speak of our union hall merely as: "Communist hall." This tends to narrow our base of activities amongst the marine workers. There must be put an end to the bureaucratic incompetence which showed itself in the failure to do anything at all to provide adequate defense and attention for Ralph Duncan, the literature agent of our union after his arrest on September 20 in union hall. This is an example of the disregard of our incompetent leadership for the welfare of our union and its membership.

We, members and active workers in the union demand an end of this state of affairs. We demand a thorough-going house cleaning. We demand that our union should begin to consider national affairs. We demand that our union should take steps to strengthen itself, to build its ranks, to wipe out bureaucracy, to establish rank and file control, to have democracy in our union. We demand correct policies. We demand an end to adventurism in the conduct of strikes. We demand responsibility in handling organization questions. We demand the removal from leadership of the present bureaucracy—Hines, Mink, Harvey. We demand that the rank and file should be given a chance to discuss the policies of our union, to adopt correct policies and to elect a new leadership which will have the confidence of our rank and file and will be able to lead in the building up of the Marine Workers Industrial Union into a mass militant union.

It is only by making such a thorough-going house cleaning, by facing and examining the facts frankly, by merciless self-criticism and correction that we can unite our forces, strengthen our organization and succeed in our aim which is the building of a powerful industrial union uniting all the marine transport workers in the country.

Marine Workers Industrial Union
Rank and File Committee

Larry Murphy*	Ernest Lobart*
M. Soderstrom*	John S. Morgan*
W. Crocket*	Joe Golden*
John Starkovitch*	John Anderson*
Joe Cass*	Henry Williams*
Joseph Murphy*	S. M. McDonald
Aal Erickson*	Edward Simmons
A. Fransen*	Ralph Duncan
C. H. Rorr*	

The Outlook for the New Movement

What are the prospects for the movement in the marine workers' Left wing which is expressed in the document we pubish here? The outlook for growth, influence and prestige is unusually excellent—providing the movement remains on the path of the revolutionary class struggle. No greater harm, nor swifter decline and degeneration, can threaten this splendid rank and file revolt than to have it turn into an anti-Communist, or anti-Communist Party movement, especially when it occurs under the outworn or hypocritical slogan of "away with the politicians" or "we want to build a trade union movement" or "this is not a party fight." The bulk of the active workers in this movement are Communists or workers wanting to be Communists. They are being and will constantly be provoked by the Stalinist bureaucracy in the hopes that they react towards an indefensible position. That cheap game of the Minks and Johnstones can be fought by persistently maintaining a revolutionary class position, by working to win the whole Left wing movement (not only the marine workers) to the cause of the rank and file opposition, by refusing to be cut loose from this Left wing for the sake of some fantastic and futile ends. That is what the Party bureaucrats areafter—to isolate this promising movement, which they fear immensely, from the general Left wing and to provoke it into an anti-Communist movement. Giving aid and comfort (whether they realize it or not) to the Party bureaucrats is a small group of syndicalists who are hoping to recreate a second edition of the I. W. . The Left wing as a whole has learned from the rich experiences of the I. W. W., but these neo-syndicalists apparently have not. Away from the Communist movement, away from the Left wing, towards a second (and miniature) edition of syndicalism—this road is sure to lead the rank and file opposition group to a futile existence, ever-diminishing, and easy marks for the blows of the Stalinists. Those who advocate this road, and they are the ones also who have back of their minds the idea of "playing with Lovestone" and other shady liquidationist elements, are helping to weaken and nullify the new movement. There are unfortunately a few of this element in the new movement. An intelligent policy by the Communist forces will not make it difficult to deal with this danger, which has been manufactured by the criminal policies of Stalinism bureaucratism), but which can be successfully eliminated by an honest revolutionary course. This obstacle overcome, and the movement will triumph irresistibly over the little Minks as well as the "bigger" Minks who give them their brief moment of power.

A Concrete Program on the Unemployed

By ALBERT WEISBORD

Continued from last issue

In the proletarian quarter alone can be affected the widest mobilization of the unemployed and of the workers generally. Here is the place where the poorer sections of the petty-bourgeoisie can be neutralized and in part won over. Here is the place where the relatives of the unemployed who may be working elsewhere can be drawn into the movement. Since the proletarian quarters usually surround large factories whose workers live in the neighborhood, here is where a living unity between employed and unemployed can be consummated and strikes of all the factories in the quarters most easily affected. Finally here is where the police are weakest and the workers strongest!

4. The fourth difference is that such a method as the proposed insures the development of leadership from among the workers and the activization of the non-Communist council members. In this respect the Party can show no worthwhile results whatever. But since large sections of workers, with the exception of those not yet expelled by the Party are "fascists", "social-fascists" or worse, what can be expected? Under the plan proposed, however, this will be changed through the small block unemployment council. Real business will be conducted by the members themselves, their own officers and executives will be elected, small dues will be paid, meetings will be held regularly, responsible work will be assigned to all, delegates will be elected to higher bodies, reports will be regularly made, policies will be initiated and understood by the rank and file, the terror of the police will be minimized, the leaders tested. In short the unemployment group becomes the real leader of its block.

We come now to the question: how is it that these simple considerations never entered the heads of the Party officials, that no such work was ever done? The answer is clear. The leaders of the Party are amateurs and worse. They never won their spurs of leadership through doing mass work in a Communist way. The few who tried mass work (like Foster et al.) did so as so-called "fascists", that is as CONSCIOUS AND LOYAL agents of the Gomperses in the American Federation of Labor. The Party has never really chosen its leaders. Foreign federationism, factionalism, and the C.I., saw to that. Finally, the Party never was and never developed into a real Communist Party in the United States. Under the able "leadership" of past and present "leaders" such a development was impossible.

III

The unemployment movement must have a comprehensive and concrete program of activity, far different from that of the faker-leaders of the party, a program that will answer the question of the workers: "What are we to do when we are hungry, are being evicted from our homes, are out of a job?" How indeed shall the hungry be fed and evictions stopped? The Party shouts "Work or Wages" or "the Insurance Bill" reminding one sometimes of the English Chartists, who, misguided by the English bourgeoisie in 1832 used to shout for "The Bill! the Bill! Nothing but the Bill!"

First a few words on the slogan "Work or Wages." Since when do Communists demand "work" from the capitalists? The "Right to Work" was never a Marxist slogan. After the proletarian revolution, the dictatorship makes it plain that every person had the DUTY to work, but before the proletarian revolution, while work means work under capitalism. work that strengthens capitalism, only A. F. of L. fakers, opportunist socialists, or worse, demand for labor "the Right to Work." But perhaps the Party is only supplementing the "theory" in Browder's pamphlet "Out of a Job" that if the capitalists recognize Russia, there will be work. "Recognize Soviet Russia and get a job goes hand in hand with the slogan "we want work"!

The new slogan "Social Insurance Bill" is a clumsy method of correcting the error in "Work or Wages" so as to throw the weight of the demand not on "work" but on "wages".

Spreading Parliamentary Illusions

It is plain to all conscious workers that the Party's social insurance bill can never be carried out in America without a proletarian revolution. This is not made clear by the Party. The Party, by making the campaign in the way it is doing, is helping only to spread opportunist and parliamentary illusions. Besides while the workers must raise the question of social insurance in the sharpest manner, making it also a slogan for building a labor party) a social insurance bill proposition can not give bread to the starving nor shelter to the evicted. How can we answer the question of the hungry and evicted jobless? ONLY BY ANSWERING: SELF HELP WILL GIVE YOU BREAD AND SHELTER! The proletarian revolution will do so permanently, seizure of food and shelter will do so immediately.

We must boldly say to the starving and destitute poor that the whole immediate objective of the unemployment movement is to seize the things necessary to live. The careful organization work in the proletarian quarters, the carefully prepared street demonstrations must all be with the thought firmly in mind of leading to that situation where the workers are enabled to help themselves of the things they need!

If the immediate major objective of the unemployment movement is the seizure of the necessaries of life, the entire program of the unemployed movement must be based on getting food and shelter for the jobless. The formation of Tenant League must be started by the unemployment movement on a large scale. Desperate resistance of every kind must be put up to every eviction that takes place. Here we can learn a great deal from the tactics used in the Passaic, New Bedford and Gastonia strikes. The widest movement of resistance, including making it unprofitable for landlords to evict, the boycott, picketing mass resistance street demonstrations and strikes can be aroused on the question of evictions and non-payment of rent. Such movements are the best teachers for the revolution.

Hand in hand with the formation of Tenant Leagues should go the formation of cooperative restaurants—we hasten to add, not like those of the "Proletcos" in Union Square, or of the "co-operative houses" in the Bronx, and not like the "soup kitchens" proposed by Party members—but real workers co-operative restaurants that will cost but very little to establish that will sell a few simple dishes at cost (and thus help those who while not destitute have but very little money), that will help compel "contributions" from other stores and restaurants, that will help to support a movement for the extension of credit by storekeepers to workers families out of work, that will wipe out the color line most effectively etc.

The question of food and shelter involves the question of wages. The unemployment movement must be closely bound up with the movement for resistance to wage cuts and worsened conditions. The unemployment movement must help in the organization of the unorganized and in the creation of a strong Left wing to win the workers in the reactionary unions to a militant policy.

The immediate program of non-payment of rent, resistance to evictions reduction of the cost of living extension of credits, seizure of food etc. as well as the fight for social insurance can be enforced only by means of street demonstrations. It is to this important question that we now turn.

Street Demonstrations

Street demonstrations and street fighting in America have an extraordinary significance. Especially at the present time, "food riots" breaking out in New York City, Chicago, Detroit, or the other large cities of the United States would be of truly enormous international importance.

This puts upon the Communists in these cities an extraordinary responsibility to prepare and to organize these demonstrations. Nothing more exposes the phrase-mongering of the Party bureaucrats than their "demonstrations". In phrase—"Fight the Police", in practice—put the workers in such a position that they could not fight. In phrase—"Seize the Streets". in practice—hold a meeting in a business district in an open square, get a lot of pictures taken buy a lot of ice-cream cones and candy sold by streeet vendors peddling in the very midst of the crowd all through the meeting and call it a "demonstration", etc. In New York City all main demonstrations have been held in Union Square. In Newark and most other cities they are staged before the city halls. "This politicalizes it don't you know."

The Party wants to fight the police. Good. But then why not think HOW to fight the police? Do the fools leading the Party ever think of this? Let us analyze the meetings at Union Square, New York City. or City Hall Newark. 1. It is in a commercial neighborhood. 2. It is a huge open square. 3. It is far from the big factories. 4. It is far from workers' neighborhoods. 5. The police entirely surround the meeting. Can you imagine a general calling on his troops to fight, who isolates his vanguard from his reserves and places them in a regular police trap? Maybe this was the way Browder fought Chiang Kai-Shek. eh? Poor Chiang Kai-Shek! If the leaders of the Party were stool-pigeons—to use the favorite expression of Browder—they could not betray a fighting movement better.

How then, should street demonstrations be organized. a. Mainly. through the block groups in proletarian neighborhoods. Here, the streets are often more narrow. Here. if fighting takes place, the workers have a chance. The buildings can be used advantageously. Here the fight can spread. The police can not easily surround it. The widest masses, wives, families, storekeepers, students, clerks, employed workers, etc. can be drawn in. Shops and factories can be pulled on strike and swept into the battle. In short, here the police are weakest and the workers strongest. Through the fighting squads organized by the block groups, a whole section of the city could be held.

b. Demonstrations should be held not merely on "ritual days" mechanically set by Moscow for the whole world. but at times when there are burning local issues to meet. The evictions of families, or a local strike, or the picketing of shops that have raised prices or a similar event, can very well become the starting point.

c. But besides that general huge demonstrations should be held so arranged that they can result in the workers helping themselves to food! This is of paramount importance, a fact that the lovers of Union Squares and City Hall Parks entirely fail to see. Such demonstrations must be most carefully prepared.

d. Marches from the proletarian quarters in mighty disciplined formations marks naturally the highest stake of the struggle to a central point or to the City Hall and should be held when the movement is widespread and well organized and when there is the greatest determination to meet the stiffest police attack. Under some circumstances, in some countries such a stage of the struggle may very well mean the beginning of the issuance of the slogan for Workers Control of the factories. etc.

The organization of such a movement can not be done without the creation of the widest united front of the workers. Of this the Party "leaders" with their theories of "Fascism" and "Social Fascism" are incapable. But it must be done. This is a test also for the Communist Opposition groups. Come, when will you mobilize your forces? When will you join hands on this issue? When will you issue a broad united front call? When will you begin the work the Party criminals can not do?

Urgent Appeal!

As our readers will note by the date of the present issue, we were compelled to skip publication of the October 15th number. The ommission was caused by the bad financial situation of the Militant which forced us last summer to go back from weekly to semi-monthly publication. To skip even a single issue of the paper now is a heavy blow to us. It means that the many of the problems with which the Militant deals regularly, the questions it takes up, the information it presents that is contained in no other revolutionary paper in this country must be neglected.

The need the Militant fills in the movement is being understood by an ever-increasing circle of workers. The Militant is more and more becoming the organ of the most conscious and thinking section of the Communist and Left wing movement. In the marine industry, in the coal miners' struggle in Illinois, in the needle trades, in the reviving Left wing in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America—in a dozen other situations, the Militant is doing pioneer work of immense significance. It is not only a semi-monthly that is required: we must have a weekly as soon as possible!

The temporary setback in regular publication which we have suffered does not at all correspond with our growth in inuence and membership. On the contrary. Our ranks and influence are growing. Our activities are multiplying. BUT OUR COMRADES AND SYMPATHIZERS HAVE NOT YET REALIZED THE FINANCIAL BURDEN THAT MUST BE CARRIED. The omission of the last number must serve to remind them sharply of this problem that must be solved by all. We can and must rely only upon our members and friends. It is they who must relieve the pressure of the financial difficulties that prevents us from executing many of the tasks that confront us so imperatively.

These of our supporters who are working must give doubly. Those of them who are out of work must give their aid by soliciting donations from other workers and friends. UNLESS WE RECEIVE SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS AND HAVE OUR REGULAR INCOME INCREASED IMMEDIATELY, THE EXISTENCE OF THE MILITANT IS DIRECTLY THREATENED.

We need five hundred dollars right away! It is not a large sum, but it will enable us to push ahead with our work. Every comrade and friend must aid—generously, swiftly, with a realization of the burning need. Check up on all unpaid bills! Make a substantial donation by mail immediately! Collect contributions from your fellow workers! Get subscriptions for the paper! Bear in mind that the Militant is in serious danger!

Send all funds immediately to the office of The Militant, 25 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y.

OUR STUDY CLASSES

Two successful classes have already been organized by the New York branch of the Communist League of America, each with an average of 25 worker-students. One is conducted by James P. Cannon, on "A History of the American Labor Movement" and the other by Albert Weisbord, on "Marxian Economics". More students have registered for the Weisbord class than there was room for, and others who registered cannot attend on Friday night which is when the class meets. To accomodate them, another class has been opened for them on Thursday nights with comrade Weisbord as director. This class begins on Thursday, November 13. Workers who have not yet registered for this course can do so by getting in touch immediately with the Militant office, at 25 Third Avenue, Room 4, New York, N. Y. The classes meet at the Labor Temple, 14th Street and 2nd Avenue: Weisbord's every Friday and Thursday, Cannon's every second Wednesday. The tuition fee is purely nominal. Make registerations immediately.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUG. 24, 1912.

Of The Militant, published weekly at New York, N. Y. for Oct. 1, 1930.

State of New York:
County of New York.

Before me, a Notary in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Max Shachtman, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Business Manager of the Militant and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in section 411, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor and business managers are:

Publisher: Communist League of America (Oppositoin) 25 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Editor: None.

Managing Editor: Max Shachtman, 25 Third Ave. New York, N. Y.

Business Manager: Martin Abern, 25 Third Avenue, New York City.

2. That the owner is: Communist League of America (Opposition)., 25 Third Avenue, N. Y. C. Martin Abern, 25 Third Avenue, N. Y. C. J. P. Cannon, 25 Third Avenue, N. Y. C. Max Schactman, 25 Third Ave. N. Y. C. Maurice Spector, 25 Third Avenue, N. Y. C. Arne Swabeck, 25 Third Ave. N. Y. C.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stock-holders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities, in a capacity other than of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

Max Shachtman, Managing Editor.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 20th day of October, 1930. M. R. Keefe, Notary Public.

(My commission expires March 30, 1931)

After the German Elections

Where Is Thaelmann Leading the German Party?

By KURT LANDAU

BERLIN—

On September 14 1930. the German working class suffered a serious defeat, whose lessons must be soberly drawn.

At the elections in May 1928, 9,150,000 votes were given to the Socialists and 3,263,000 to the Communists out of a total vote of 30,000,000; altogether 12.413.000 votes were given for Communism and reformism. It is clear that the millions of workers who follow reformism do not do it because of Noske and Scheidemann, but in spite of them, for they have not yet grasped the bourgeois character of the S.P.G., the reactionary character of reformism.

Altogether, the C. P. G. and S. P. G. received 40.4 percent of the voters in the elections.

On September 14, 1930, the number of votes cast rose from 30,700.000 to 34,942,854. The C. P. G. got 4,587,807 votes, the S. P. G. only 8,572,000; together, it is about- 13, 150,000 votes out of the total of 35,000,000, which is only 37.5 percent. that is, a decline of 3 percent. or expressed in numbers, about one million votes! The question as to who benefitted by this decline is the decisive question we pose, for it signalizes the most serious dangers, it shows just the thing that the C.P.G. leadership as well as the S.P.G. conceals: **That Fascism succeeded to penetrate into the proletariat.**

Our Party gained about 1,300,000 votes. Since the electorate was larger. and the total number of votes rose about 15 percent, then about 500,000 votes must be taken off the 1,300,000 which are to be reckoned to the increased participation in the election. The actual increase of the Party then amounts to 800,000 votes.

The S.P.G.. compared to 1928, lost 600,000 votes, that is about the same amount as the increase of the C.P.G. Did our Party then collect the loss of the S. P. G.? **That is just what is not the case in large measure!**

Out of the 30,7000,000 votes in 1928, the S.P.G. got 9,100,000. To remain relatively as strong, it would have had to get about 15 percent more votes—in view of the increased electorate of 3,500,000—or, in round numbers 1,400,000. Its total loss therefore amounts to 2,000,000 votes, it having declined from 29.8 percent of the total to 24.7 percent. **Out of these 2,000,000, the C.P.G. got only 800,000.** Sixty percent, that is 1,200,000, fell to Fascism! This may be drastically demonstrated in a series of instances. In Berlin, for instance, the S.P.G. lost 38,100 votes in the Friedrichshain, Kreuzberg, Tiergarten, Schoenberg districts —despite the increased electorate—and the C.P.G. gained 29.250 votes in the same districts. About 10.000 votes. and new voters at that, were lost to the Fascists. In the country as a whole, this inroad of the Fascists into the workers' camp comes to light even more plainly. In the Breslau election district, for example, the S.P.G. lost more than 50,000 votes compared with 1928, the C..P.G. gained 40.000; 10,000 votes, plus the increased voting, that is, about 50,000 votes, went to Fascism, which swung from 9,262 to—259.225 and became the second largest party. In the proletarian section of Merseburg, the S.P.G. held fairly to its 1928 position. The C.P.G. won more than 40,000 votes through the increased vtoing, but the Fascists rose from 40,693 to 243,896, and pulled to themselves the share of the S.P.G. in the increased voting, that is, proletarian votes. In the North Westphalian election district, the Fascists rose from 12,118 to 161,723. The S.P.G. lost about 30,000 votes as against 1928, which the C.P.G. absorbed. The increase in votes came to the good of the Fascists exclusively.

An exact analysis of the election results confirms the fact that Fascism won far more than 1,000,000 proletarian votes which it cornered for itself and did not take from the reservoir of the bourgeois parties.

That the Fascists have become the heirs to the bourgeois parties requires no special evidence. that is demonstrable immediately by the figures themselves. The German National Party, which split up a few months ago, lost about one million votes, after counting off what was taken by the People's Conservatives Christian Nationals, etc. The German People's Party lost more than a million as against 19.8. These 2,000,000, plus the 15 percent increase in votes, which corresponds to almost another million, fell to the Fascists.

To this must be added about a million votes they took away from the bourgeois-"splinter" parties. then the 1,250,000 proletarian votes gained, and the 800,000 which the Fascists got in 1928. These are the factors that make up — according to an approximate and schematic survey — the election figure of the Fascists (6,401,210). The Fascists became the strongest bourgeois party—as we foresaw it. Besides them, there is only one other bourgeois party the Center (Catholics) that remained stable and with a gain of 500,000 votes and 7 mandates retained its share of the increased electoral figure.

In East Prussia (235,463), the Fascists became the strongest party in the election districts of Breslau, Liegnitz, Magdeburg, Merseburg, Thuringia, Schleswig-Holstein. Weser-Ems, East Hanover, Brunswick, Hessen-Naussau, Cologne,Aachen. Coblenz-Trier, Palatinate, Dresden, Bautzen, Chemnitz-Zwickau, Baden. Hessen-Darstadt, Hamburg and Mecklenburg, that is, in far more than half the election districts, they became the second strongest party. They outstripped the C.P.G. (135,210) in Hamburg with 144,584 votes, the same in Chemnitz-Zwickau, etc.

It is the greatest self-deception to believe that the 4,500,000 Communist votes are already won for the revolutionary class struggle. To educate them to this—there lies one of the principal tasks of our Party. Today a large part of our electorate is composed of the despairing and discontented and there are doubtlessly hundreds of thousands among them who, gained in a purely parliamentary election campaign, expect an immediate improvement of their condition from the simple electoral success of the C.P.G.

The S.P.G. suffered a **heavy reversal.** But it would be wrong to speak of its "annihilating defeat" (see **Rote Fahne**) or to contend that it is "the beginning of the end" of the S.P.G. (Brandler's **Arbeiterpolitik.**)

In many places, the S.P.G. showed itself to be relatively able to offer resistance, as in Saxony, where it gained 120,-000 votes in comparison to the Landtag elections in June, in South Germany, etc. The foundations of the S.P.G. were not shattered by the heavy reversal.

Just as wrong is the hope that Fascism will break up **of itself,** of its internal contradictions. When the **Rote Fahne** writes on September 15: "Yesterday was Herr Hitler's 'greatest day,' but the so-called election victory of the National Socialists is the beginning of their end," then this is an all too cheap consolation which is only exceeded by the sagacious prophecy on September 16: "September 14 was the high point of the National Socialist movement in Germany. What comes after can only be decline and ebb."

Whether that is how things will turn out, or Fascism will succeed in taking over the political power in the state. will not depend upon the prophecies of the **Rote Fahne,** but upon the policy that our Party adopts in the class struggle. **The hopes placed upon the self-disintegration of Fascism is as deceptive as it is reformistic, for it overlooks the decisive factor in political development: the policy of the revolutionary party.**

We warned against illusions when the Party leadership declared the splitting away of the petty-bourgeois group of ideologists around Otto Srasser to be the beginning of the collapse of Fascism. We came out against the naive idea that Frick's participation in the Thuringian government would **by itself** rapidly expose Fascism. Such hopes and illusions are unworthy of a Communist.

The general crisis of capitalism is being accentuated in Germany by the Young Plan. It was the most ruinous mistake of our Party leadership that it did not understand in the summer of 1929 to develop a genuine revolutionary mass movement against the Young Plan. In our appeal to the Saxony elections, we wrote (June 1930):

"The Party leadership does not recognize that the central aim of the class struggle in Germany is the organization of mass resistance to the Young Plan; to the extent that the masses of Germany enter this struggle, they overcome their illusion and recognize from their own experiences that there is no other way of eliminating this intolerable slave pact than the revolutionary way: the overthrow of capitalism itself."

This failure of the Party permitted Fascism to organize a mass movement against the Young Plan as a **counter-revolutionary, chauvinistic** action, with the aim of leading the masses in this way for an active imperialstic war policy for the new German imperialism. When the Party leadership—after Fascism had already begun its victorious march through Germany—recognized this ruinous negligence. it leaped to the **opposite** extreme, as its nationalistic programmatic declaration shows: it entangled itself in nationalistic phrases and high-sounding promises.

The struggle against the Young Plan and in the final analysis against Versailles, can only be conducted by the collaboration of the international proletariat. The Thaelmanns, who in 1929 "forgot" to fight against the Young Plan, and now roar hysterically and nationalistically against it when they see the growth of Fascism as a result of this "forgetting", are no less guilty than the Stalins, Molotovs, and Manuilskys, who have shown themselves incompetent to see the problems of the international class struggle at all, and to organize the joint struggle of the German, French, English and Polish Communists, of the whole Comintern, against the Young Plan.

Our Party has strengthened its influence in the working class in spite of the destructive mistakes of the leadership. The elemental discontentment of the workers with the brutal dictatorship regime, the general capitalist process of dissolution which is taking place before our very eyes, the hatred against the treasonable policy of reformism, brought us new masses. But that Fascism succeeded to grow **at an incomparably swifter tempo**—and not least of all among the proletarian youth—must be an alarm signal for our Party.

Only when the Party executes a genuinely serious turn, will it be in a position to repel the Fascist wave, to lead the masses forward in bitter mass actions, to put the proletarian, revolutionary, solution of the crisis on the order of the day.

Thaelmann—that is not a person, but a personification of the political regime in our Party: vacillating, reeling from illusion to illusion, fulminating phrases for the masses, impotent in the struggle against the capitalist offensive and Fascism, powerful and self-conscious within the Party when it is necessary to trample serious proletarian criticism under the iron heel of the aparatus. This political and inner-Party regime is now getting drunk on the election success. The intoxication is brief, the awakening inevitable. It will soon be seen how far the **power of action** of the Party exists in the coming strike struggles. in the struggle for the jobless. in the struggle against Fascism.

To call a halt to the stormy Fascist tide, to repulse it, requires: Swiftest consolidation of the ideological foundation of the Party, which is being destroyed by national-Bolshevik phrases and theories on "social-fascism." The Party must adjust its internationalist, class front. every Party member must recognize that we must win the social democratic worker in tenacious struggle in order to erect together with him the class front.

All illusions must be given up, things must be seen as they are in all their seriousness. It is not yet too late. The social democratic workers are beginning to think. The threatening Fascist danger is strengthening the urge to unity in the working class. A correct Leninist policy must lead to united revolutionary fighting front between the C.P.G. and S.P.G. workers. A correct policy, that is, one that understands precisely now how to burst the contradiction, by means of the united front tactic. between the social democratic workers who want to fight and the counter-revolutionary leaders.

The election victory will enormously increase the impact of Fascism. In the factories, on the streets, its hordes will advance against the proletarian mass organizations. The more it shows itself to be incapable of fighting for work or bread for the deceived masses, the more it will drive them forward against the class conscious workers. In the blood of the proletarian vanguard it seeks to benumb the hunger of the backward sections of the proletariat.

The most decisive weapon in the struggle of the working class is the revolutionary party. The mistakes of our leadership will be paid for by the working class with just as many victims as the betrayal of the reformists.

The responsibility that lies upon us is growing. Our struggle has not become lighter, but heavier. We exerted our efforts to assist the Party to success. The cadres of the Left Opposition who worked in every part of Germany side by side with the Party comrades, have every reason to be joyous at the success attained by our Party. But they renounce hymns of victory, they see the threatening dangers. and they will have to increase their efforts tenfold in order to help the Party, which has not yet grasped the whole import of the situation, to fulfill its duty, to organize the proletarian revolution in Germany.

IN JEWISH

JUST RECEIVED FROM POLAND

My Life

By LEON TROTSKY

In Two Volumes of 700 Pages

Five Dollars for Both Volumes

Order from

THE MILITANT

25 Third Avenue . . . New York, N. Y.

THE LATEST PAMPHLET BY COMRADE LEON TROTSKY

The Turn in the Communist International and the German Situation

JUST WRITTEN : : JUST PUBLISHED

A keen analysis of the latest turn in policy of the present leadership of the Communist International in connection with an examination of the results of the recent elections in Grmany. Comrade Trotsky reveals the relationship of forces between the proletariat, the big and small bourgeoisie, and their political parties, and presents the perspectives for the great dilemna in Germany: Communism of Fascism.

10 cents a copy : : 7 cents in bundles.

Order Now From

THE MILITANT

25 Third Avenue New York, N. Y.

Young Vanguard

On Saturday Otcober 11th a conference of young needle trades workers was held in New York by the Youth Section of the N. T. W. I. U. The latter, after having carried on no real activity since its organization, suddenly decided to organize the mass of needle trades youth. This was to be one of the accomplishments of the Y. C. L. leadership under its "shock plan."

Preparation for such an affair is of utmost importance. Since no previous work had been carried on among the youth, because of the general weakness of the N. T. W. I. U.; the fact that the mass of the youth in the industry have never been in any union; these are some of the conditions which necessitate well organized, persistent, conscientious preparatory activity. However the "shock plan" had (!) to be carried out; another "youth conference" had to be added to the record; an almost countless number of conferences of young workers in the various industries were to be held before September 30.

The Needle Trade Youth Conference was therefore originally called for September 21. Two or three afternoon open air meetings were held, a leafiet or two issued, the Shop Delegates Council of the N. T. W. I. U. was notified and preparations were completed! But when the hour for the opening of the Conference arrived, even the official leadership could not go through with it. The handful of delegates who assembled were told that the Conference had been postponed until October 11.

However, very little additional agitation had been carried on. A few more afternoon meetings were held, a notice now and then in the **Daily Worker** and little more. At an open air meeting held a day before the Conference in front of the International Tailoring Corporation, at Fourth Ave., and Twelve Street, no leaflets were issued; the youth speakers did not even know the hour that the Conference was to be held. This in spite of the fact that the head of the National Youth Dept. of the N. T. W. I. U. was present! An otherwise good meeting ended with no organizational results. We do not know whether this is a typical case, but the showing at the October 11th Conference seems to indicate as much.

Of the fifty or so delegates present, the overwhelming majority were from Left wing controlled shops or were previous members of the Union. An insignificent handful were new delegates from completely unorganized places, or obtained during the campaign (?) for the Conference. There were apparently no representives of large shops.

Called for 2:30, the Conference opened after 4. Most of the time was taken up with talk. Not the kind which would make the delegates feel that they were running the Conference, deciding on policies, etc., but on the contrary, orders were given, telling what should be done, how to do it, how not to function. This was followed by the chairman asking the young workers present to join in the discussion. The delegates were naturally reluctant. Several of the more experienced rank and filers spoke.

The tone of the reports and comments by the so-called leaders of the Conference was: the youth should be in the leadership of the movement; the young needle workers are the most militant section in the industry; the Youth Dept. of the N. T. W. I. U. is making great efforts to win over the youth; the young workers will be especially needed in the front ranks of the coming dress strike.

The fact that the youth is the most militant, the most active section of the industry has much truth in it, but whether it should lead the struggle is highly questionable. Especially in a class-struggle union, it should be the most experienced, the most theortically advanced who should lead. And this is usually found among the adults rather than the youth.

Then the time came for a report and discussion on the Program (the draft of which was distributed to the delegates) the chairman was notified by the janitor that the room had to be vacated—the rental time had already expired. The Program Committee report took up a few minutes: It suggested that the Draft be accepted subject to minor changes to be made by the incoming Executive. With no discussion, the report was accepted including a "Plan of Action," (where have we heard this before?) The latter consisted of eight tasks such as the establishment of a functioning Youth Committee of the Union, and a Youth Delegates' Council; the organization of four functioning youth sections of buildings in various crafts of the industry; formation of four shop committees in large places employing young workers by December 15; establishment of training school; support of clothing workers' sports club; of **Needle Worker;** founding of a bi-weekly Youth Bulletin by Nov. 15th, etc. In a word a general plan, which is not very difficult to put on paper, but even if good, required correct strategical and tactical policies to put in practice as well as correct leadership.

After the acceptance of the Program, several of the delegates pledged specific sums of money for the coming dress strike. Motions suddenly came from the floor on Greetings to Minor, then one to Foster, Amter, Raymond; suddenly some one rebuked the Conference for forgetting Harry Eisman the young Pioneer serving at Hawthorne.

A motion was then carried endorsing the Communist Party in the election campaign. The next and final point was the election of a Youth Executive. The main business of the conference squeezed into about ten minutes; the delegates listened; the "leader laid down the line." **No** genuine steps forward had been taken by the Conference.—J. F.

(The next issue of the **Young Vanguard** will carry a criticism of the Program and the Plan of Action accepted at the Conference).

The Civil War in Brazil

Brazil is the fourth South American country to overthrow the government in the course of the last three months.

In Bolivia and Peru, with the sympathy of the great masses, the liberal bourgeoisie staged triumphant movements, and supported by British imperialism managed to defeat the feudal elements which for years, while in power, had worked hand in hand with Wall Street financial interests.

In Argentina the pro-British government of Hipolito Irigoyen was turned out by a military coup of the big bourgeoisie supported by American imperialism. A virtual reign of terror was then instituted against the proletarian organiations. The Communist and anarchist press has been suppressed and several anarchist and anarcho-syndicalist leaders have been executed.

The Brazilian revolt, however, is in reality a much more complex affair than either of the other three countries mentioned. Brazil is in area the largest country in the Western Hemisphere and has a population of 39 million, concentrated principally in different parts of the east and the south. Throughout this immense area the industries and agricultural products are quite diversified and the local governments which have a surprisingly great amount of local autonomy, even to the point of having their own armies) represent generally speaking the respective interests of the local exploiters. The principal crop in the country is coffee, with rubber as an important second and cacao, livestock, grain, mining, etc., also quite important in their respective regions.

The deposed Brazilian government was above all a representative of the coffee interests as was quite natural with coffee as the outstanding commercial product. Brazil produces the bulk of the world's coffee. During the period of crisis which, especially inasmuch as coffee is concerned, has been very long, the government of Washington Luiz has attempted all sorts of schemes to protect, by artificial means, the interests of coffee growers. First came the valorization plan by which the surplus product was stored to force a rise in prices on the market. After the failure of this scheme, loans were secured in BOTH Great Britain and the United States for the protection of these coffee raisers and to relieve the crisis in the industry. The liberal bourgeoisie whose interests conflict violently with those of the semi-feudal coffee producers protested energetically against these extensive foreign loans which benefited the coffee industries alone.

The recent rebellion was brought about by a combination of all the opposition forces, especially those of the petty bourgeoisie, and representing generally the interests of most of the secondary industries of the country. Counting on a wide mass support, which was natural as a result of the years of dictatorial rule under the Washington Luiz regime, the rebellion was initiated by the action of several sates and after some fighting was enabled within a few weeks to dominate the country. As the ship was sinking, the army, (whether acting for the coffee growers or not still rmeains to be seen) threw the president overboard and attempted a compromise with the rebels. The compromise being rejected, the army officers, glad to have saved their own brave hides, were obliged to cede to the demands of the new regim.

A False Analysis of the Situation

The Communist Party of Brazil, and in imitation of it, the American Party also, have continually painted the Washington Luiz government as being pro-British, picturing the interests of the semi-feudal coffee intersts as identical with those of British imperialism. Although they quite correctly point out that British investments in Brazil are double those of the U. S., they fail to consider that the enormous majority of the Brazilian coffee crop is marketed in New York. This is an entirely false and over-simple analysis of the real case, as both imperialisms are deeply interested in Brazilian coffee, while the secondary industries are controlled some by one imperialism and some of the other. Inasmuch as the rubber industry is concerned, the Washington Luiz regime has shown decided favoritism to the Ford interests as against their British rivals.

Our comrades of the Leninist Left Opposition in Brazil, through their monthly organ **A Lucta de Classe** have demonstrated clearly the incorrectness of the official Party's analysis, and have further pointed out that in Brazil, due to the complexities of the economic structure, with the existing diversification of products, each region having its staple, and a mutual though conflicting interest on part of both imperialisms as regards the most important product (coffee), it is impossible to say that either of the two leading imperialist powers actually supported, in the true sense of the word, either one of the two Brazilian partie. Both imperialisms made pacts and agreements with both groups as the particular situation required.

The action of the Wall Street government in rushing to the aid of the old Brazilian regime on the eve of its collapse, undoubtedly induced to lend its support in exchange for promises of future juicy concessions, demonstrates the falsity of the C. P.'s analysis and goes a long way towards confirming that of the Brazilian Left Opposition. Only acrobats can believe the analysis which declares, in the October 21 issue of the **Daily Worker,** that Wall Street, after having supported the rebellion, turned a triple somersault and flew to the aid of the regime that had already been fatally weakened through its own efforts. The Wall Street millionaire are shrewder oliticians than certain of the **Daily Worker's** star reporters and are certainly not fools enough to do that.

The official press of the American Communist party has dealt very absurdly with the whole problem from the outset. Until the appearance of the aforementioned article the **Worker** and the other Party organs, shouted loudly that the rebellion was supported by Wall Street. The most ludicrous instance of bureaucratic stupidity of the really naive kind to be found in this already too-much-abused "Third Period" appeared in the Freiheit (Oct. 11, 1930), in an article informing us that a **"Mass Communist Uprising Captures the Third Largest City in Brazil."** Nothing was said in the **Daily Worker** concerning an event, which were it true, would have been of enormous revolutionary significance. In reality all that happened (we were forced to find out through the New York **Times**), was that during a street demonstration of workers in Bahia, several plate glass windows were smashed and a few street cars were overturned. (We will be called counter-revolutionists for saying this, as we are almost every other time that we tell the truth).

The Party Putsch

In Rio de Janeiro however, it seems that the party comrades, staged a melee, in an attempt to "capture power" . . . and were suppressed with numerous casualties, after a couple of hours by the troops and police. The **Daily Worker** commenting on this last isolated outbreak, which bears all the ear marks of a suicidal putsch, says in its issue of October 28, "The fight of the workers under the leadership of the Communist Party of Brazil shows the deep going radicalization of the masses and the fact that the workers and poor peasants are beginning to put forward their independent demands against their own bourgeoisie as well as against all imperialist forces."

The C. P. of Brazil has, unfortunately, already dicredited itself before the masses because of its "anti-imperialist" adventures and its election fizzle with the "Workers and Peasants Block." It is incapable with its many opportunist and ultra-Left defects of leading the masses effectively in struggle.

Our small Left Opposition group in Brazil has already in its ranks a number of serious revolutionary fighters expelled from the Party for their consistent struggle against the opportunism of the leadership. The Bolshevik-Leninists of Brazil have before them the task of rallying about themselves the best proletarian elements of the Party in order to reconstitute and build the Brazilian Communist movement, for the organization of the working class and the strugle for Communism in Brazil.

R. BLACKWELL.

On the New Farmer-Labor Party Proposal

Continued from page 3

class party people from Montant, A. C. Miller who still sees nothing wrong with running in the Repubican Party primaries—and the Left Opposition? It is not difficult to decide.

We would go there only in order to tell them that we shall have nothing to do with their movement—and for no other conceivabe purpose. Whom would our agitation and point of view concert in this quiet, confidential conference? Workers, or their rank and file representatives? They will not be present. Or do we expect to convert to a Marxian position the Lovestoneites who seek to liquidate the Communist movement, who feel like fish in water when they are toying with "mass" petty bourgeois movements? Or the Finnish leaders who knowing better, raised their hands to the skies in the Party to expel us, and only broke with the Party when the latter's leaders—under pressure of the Left sentiment in the Party—began in their characteristically clumsy, stupid and ineffectual manner, it is true to deal with the opportunist corrosion eating into the vitals of the Finnish Communist movement in the Northwest. Let the Finnish business men seeking political cover for their opportunism and the corrupt adventurers in the Lovestone camp who are violating every Communist principle once respected in the movement—go their way. We will build seriously and substantially on the foundation of the class struggle.

4. It is asked: What role have we to play in this "movement"? That was the question put by the great strategists of the Pepper-Lovestone-Bedacht school in relation to the LaFollette movement. Only with the aid of the Comintern, at that time under the direct pressure of the Russian Opposition, was the correct answer given. We can give the same reply now. Our role is to disclose the character of this movement publicly to the workers, to reveal its adventurist and opportunist nature to fight intransigeantly against its deceptions. If Pepperism in 1924 was a tragedy, this pitiful caricature of 1930 will undoubtedly be and is, a farce. We want nothing to do with it.

Our moment, which arose and is developing in the merciless struggle against the revisionism of Marxism in the revolu- and its twin adventurism, against all varieties of fakery, exaggeration, of inflated, boosted and "promoted" movements which collapse of their own emptiness can only gain from adopting such an attitude. We are confident that our Minneapolis comrades will concur in our point of view which is dedicated solely by concern over the interests and future not only of our group in particular but the working class movement as a whole.

National Committee
Communist League of America (Opposition)
Per Max Shachtman

If the number on your wrapper is

57

then your subscription to the **Militant** has expired. Renew immediately in order to avoid missing any issues.